

Industrial concerns cancel on-campus recruiting drives

by MELANIE BAUCHNER

A recent exchange of letters between Barry Crago, Acting Chairman of the Association at McGill to End the War in Viet Nam, and Principal H. Locke Robertson has confirmed that interviewers from several large manufacturing concerns will not be recruiting personnel on campus.

The Association sent a letter to the Principal on November 3 expressing its concern over co-operation given to companies which are "engaged in supplying materials vital to the American war effort in Viet Nam."

The letter further suggested that "such co-operation with these and similar companies is incompatible with the ideals of a university — an institution traditionally dedicated to the improvement of man."

The companies cited are Dow Chemical of Canada, Hawker-Siddeley, Canada, Canadian Industries Limited, Cyanamid of Canada and United Aircraft of Canada.

Letter signed by faculty members

Information regarding aid given by these companies to "prosecution of an unjust war" was furnished by the Universities Faculty Committee for Peace in Viet Nam and the letter itself co-signed by approximately 60 McGill faculty members.

A second letter, sent November 16, noted the failure of the Principal to respond and indicated that since the companies in question were scheduled to hold interviews this week, further action was planned unless word was received by Friday at 5 pm.

In his reply of November 16, the Principal stated his desire to avoid "disturbances" and notified the Association that on-campus interviews would not be held: "Two of the companies have already completed interviews. Because of the possibility that the other three companies would not wish to be involved in disturbances and because of the university's equal concern on this score, I have obtained the consent of these three companies that their interviews be held on their own premises, or at least outside the campus."

(Continued on page 2)

Motion of writ served on Senate Committee

John Fekete, through his lawyer Claude-Armand Sheppard, has served a "motion for a writ of evocation" on McGill University, the Senate Committee on Student Discipline, the committee's individual members and Principal Dr. H. Locke Robertson.

The motion, a public document filed in the courts yesterday and numbered 742095, asked the courts to order: "The issue of a writ of summons of evocation", "that all respondents immediately cease and desist from any further proceedings and prosecutions" against John Fekete with

Extensive excerpts from Fekete's motion for a writ appear on pages five and six.

respect to the Boll Weevils case, and "that respondents, and particularly McGill University, do not do anything which might affect the status quo of Petitioner's position or constitute a retaliation against him for taking the present proceedings..."

It went on to ask the Court: "Should this Honorable Court decide not to evoke the present case, that respondents be ordered to conduct a hearing of the charges against Petitioner in a quasi-judicial manner, in accordance with the rules of natural justice, in public and before an unbiased tribunal; the whole with costs."

The motion alleged that "there is every reason to believe that justice cannot be conducted in a Roman Circus atmosphere..."

It stated that the Court "has a right and a duty to intervene in view of the gross irregularities attending the prosecution of the charges" including "the decision of the Committee on Student Discipline that it would not grant to a person charged publicly and persecuted by publicity, a public hearing to vindicate himself, but requesting him to select an alternative between star chamber proceedings or a television spectacle."

The motion questioned the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee.

Senate Committee

The Senate Committee on Student Discipline will meet today at 3:15 pm to hear the case of John Fekete. If the Committee decides to postpone Fekete's case, it will hear Peter Allnutt and Pierre Fournier. The proceedings will be televised in L 132.

Councillors object to executive's poll

by JAN WYLLIE and JOHN LOVELL

Nine Council members have issued a statement in which they "strongly protest" that the Executive did not consult Council before arranging for tomorrow's opinion poll on the administration's position in charging three students.

It reads in part, "Leaving aside the question of the wording of this particular ballot, if Students' Council were to recognize this procedure as valid by taking its results as evidence, it would set a dangerous precedent in student affairs, in that it would tend to give over into the hands of the three-man executive an important power which constitutionally resides with the Students' Council and the Students' Society at large."

The statement is signed by the three representatives from Arts and Science, Peter Foster, Ian Hyman and Saul Ship, Bill Lenihan (Graduate Studies), Nicole Ledue (Women's Union), Douglas Bacon (Divinity), Robert de Man (Architecture), Bob Hajaly (Engineering) and Pat Cavanaugh (Engineering).

Other councillors, however, did not share their feelings. Internal Vice-President Danny Trevick, who first conceived of the poll, said "I want to know what the students think of this question. I believe in democracy and this is democracy in action."

The poll asks 1) whether the administration should drop the charges and 2) whether there should be a student strike on the matter.

Harvey Schachter (Commerce) said he was generally in favor of having polls and would be strongly influenced by the results.

The statement also finds fault with the wording of the questions being polled. Hyman called the first part "deceptive" in that the issue under consideration is whether action was the responsibility of the administration or the students, and not whether the Daily managing board should be ousted or retained. Ship also felt the wording could be misleading.

Hajaly, though he signed the statement, felt Council was to a great extent to blame for the executive's move. He said it was "unfortunate that the SC did not foresee that the administration was not about to give way and did not legislate a more specific plan of action."

Foster felt this poll was equivalent to a referendum and thus violates the Students' Society constitution, which states that an open meeting must be called before a referendum can be held.

(Continued on page 2)

This time at U of T

Dow Chemical hit again

TORONTO (CUP) — More than 80 students and faculty held a vice-president of the University of Toronto and an employment officer of the Dow Chemical Company of Canada virtual prisoners in the U of T Placement Service building for three and a half hours Monday.

The demonstration, organized by the U of T Committee To End The War in Viet Nam, consisted of picketing in the morning and an afternoon sit-in to protest the production of napalm.

Organizers of the demonstration met at noon with Vice-President Robin Ross and the Dow recruiting interviewer to ask that employment recruiting on campus for summer employment with Dow be stopped.

The demand was not met and at 2 pm protesting students and faculty linked arms, sat down and blocked the entrance to the building where the interviews were being held.

A pamphlet prepared by the U of T Committee to End The War in Viet Nam made two demands which organizers said must be met before the sit-in would end: that the administration suspend Dow recruiting until the matter is brought under the control of the Student Council, and that further interviews be under the direct supervision of the Student Council.

Towards the end of the sit-in, the Dow representative promised that he would not continue

interviews on campus Tuesday or Wednesday, the day of the Student Council meeting.

After considerable discussion, he was allowed to leave at 5 pm under a canopy of raised arms, flanked by plainclothes policemen.

Vice-President Ross was detained for about half an hour, when he said he would consult the members of the faculty about meeting the demands.

If these demands are not met by 8:30 pm Tuesday, the CEWW will stage a sit-in to block the university administration building.

Throughout the sit-in and protest, Toronto police were always nearby but took no action. At one point they had to break up a fight between an Engineering student and a member of the ultra-right wing Edmund Burke Society who was heckling the demonstrators.

Both Metro and U of T police looked on passively as chemical engineering students fought and scrambled their way over the inert bodies toward the placement service and out again. There were no arrests.

McGILL LIBRARY
NOV 21 1967

WITNESSES

In conjunction with l'Université de Montréal and SGWU, any students who witnessed arrests during the UGEQ demonstration Friday are asked to meet in the Union in 123-124 today at 1 pm.

Classified

FOR SALE

WINGS LIKE EAGLES — colour movie kicks off program of movies, tours, weekend flights and piloting courses. See it at the membership rally: McConnell Engineering 304, 1 p.m. Wednesday.

RACCOON COAT — size 12. Très comp. Perfect for blizzards, football games, etc. Call 845-7341 between 5 and 7.

MEN'S SKI BOOTS: size 9½, worn 3 times, excellent condition, reasonable price. Call Allan 488-6060 after 7 p.m.

HOUSING

YOUNG GIRL WANTS SAME to share 4 room apartment — own room, Westmount. Please call 932-1040.

DU MOUSE — 3434 McTavish, large spacious accommodation. Enquire Bill Storey, 849-0344.

FURNISHED APARTMENT 1½ on Durocher. Lease to Sept. '68. Access to parking. Immediate, weekday evenings 288-0882.

FURNISHED ROOM TO LET within walking distance from McGill. (10 min.). Kitchen facilities available. Call after 6 pm 843-5703.

FOR RENT: 1½ apt. wall to wall carpet, drapes, Sauna Pool, etc. Downtown, 5 minutes from "My Father's Moustache." Tel. 932-3893.

LARGE DOUBLE ROOM in downtown Montreal available — very quiet. Call 388-9533 after 6:30 p.m.

FOUND

ON SUNDAY MORNING, 2:15 a.m., set of keys on Austin Healey keyholder. At Sherbrooke and University. Contact 849-0061 room 225.

WANTED

ALL PERSONS NAMED ICARUS and any interested by some aspect of aviation invited to take off of Flying Club (movies to be shown) E 304 1 p.m. Wednesday.

RIDES

TWO GIRLS NEED RIDE to New Haven Conn. or thereabouts Nov. 22, p.m. or Nov. 23 a.m. Please call Ginny 842-0327.

TRANSPORTATION REQUIRED on paying basis. Dupuis (Cote des Neiges) to downtown daily. Approximately 8:15 am and 5:30 pm. Possibly 2 passengers. Call 735-0191.

TYPING

TYPIST, EXPERIENCED in theses, term papers, etc., seeks work at home. For information call 482-5749, Mrs. Bendit.

MISCELLANEOUS

PARTY OR DANCE — swing out to the best bands in town. Book now through Boom Enterprises. 681-2698; 276-6952; 482-7056.

WANTED: CO-ED for friendly "poodle". Please call 844-0936, rooms 326, 330, 335, 336, 337.

FRUSTRATED? WATCH THIS SPACE.

DRESSMAKER: makes all types of alterations on dresses. 3537 Park. Phone: 842-5978.

THIS YEAR SATYAN will give private lessons again. Physics, chemistry, math and engineering subjects of any grade at McGill. If you have problems with any of the above, call collect at 819-478-7669 and leave message if not available.

ATTENTION FEMALE STUDENTS: The Department of Hematology at the Royal Victoria Hospital in conjunction with McGill University Health Service is carrying out a study on blood in females, between the ages of 21-26. NOTE: A remuneration of \$15.00 is offered to each participant. The following conditions must be met: (1) no serious illnesses or operations within one year; (2) no blood donation within six months; (3) no vitamin preparations containing iron, and NO HORMONE COMPOUNDS of any nature; (4) volunteers must not have borne children; (5) no history of anaemia in the family; (6) no unusual dietary habits or fads. Interested students please call: Dr. Adams (R.V.H.), 841-1251 local 1637 or R.V.C. Infirmary, VI. 4-6311, local 420.

THERE WILL BE a constitutional meeting at the Chess Club Room B26, Mon. Dec. 4 at 1 - 2 p.m.

ORGAN PLAYER looking for work in existing band. Bass keys with organ. After 9 p.m. Monday to Thurs. Keith — 387-5449.

WANTED: DRUMMER for group complete except for same, to do all originals. (Object commercial — creative. Phone Jon, 737-3749 around midnight.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY. Helen, from Gail, Inis, Ellen, Debbie, Ellen, Nadja, Sandy, Marv, Carole and your sisters from Delta Phi Epsilon.

MALE AND FEMALE Canadians needed for a program of Indian dancing. Intensive training will be given. Call 481-2924.

DRAFT DRAFTER seeks persons with apartment in share. Contact or leave message. Room 7, 3454 Ste. Famille.

Recruiting drives... (Continued from page 1)

Nelther Principal Robertson nor his executive assistant George Grimson would comment on the issue, although Professor Tomas Pavlasek, Chairman of the University Placement Committee, said "It would be useful if the committee could function with a full complement, which includes the student members not yet appointed."

None of the companies involved were willing to elaborate on the situation, although Cyanamid did say they held interviews on campus two weeks ago.

On American campuses, most notably Berkeley and the University of Wisconsin, recruitment on campus by companies actively engaged in the war effort has repeatedly triggered demonstrations and riots.

Councillors... (Continued from page 1)

Martin Dreyer (Music) favored the poll because it is "the closest we can get to what the man on the campus thinks" and would be a more accurate estimate of student opinion than are Council meetings, "which are surrounded by jeering, hissing crowds."

Lenihan called the move "a technique by which the executive could forestall taking a stand" and objected that the executive did not consult Council on the decision to take the poll.

Michael Blau (Dentistry) said "I have nothing against an opinion poll but I feel it should be conducted by Council, not by the executive."

Michael Vineberg (Law) agreed with "the principle of Council acting on the opinion of the students. The Council was not elected to determine such a situation and it is our duty to find out what the students think."

Students' Society President Peter Smith said "The poll would allow the students to express themselves, and would affect the positions of both the SC and the administration." He hoped for a high voter turnout.



CHEMCELL

will conduct

CAMPUS INTERVIEWS

on

November 22 and 23

for

Chemical Engineers

Electrical Engineers

Mechanical Engineers

Masters of Business Administration

Positions available at Edmonton, Alta., Drummondville and Montreal, Que.

For literature on Chemcell, job descriptions and interview appointment, please visit your placement office.

ELDORADO

ELDORADO MINING AND REFINING LIMITED

ELDORADO REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR INTERVIEWS
ON CAMPUS, NOVEMBER 27th.

Opportunities exist in the following fields:

Permanent Employment: Geologists

Mining Engineers

Mechanical Engineers

Electrical Engineers

Summer Employment: Geologists (Post Grads, Undergrads)

Mining Engineers

Chemical Engineers

Metallurgical Engineers

Mechanical Engineers

Electrical Engineers

Commerce (3rd year)

Contact the Student Placement Office for interview times and further information.



LINDA QUEEN: Linda Ho, second from the right above, was chosen ISA queen last night. She, along with her four princesses is shown above at the opening ceremonies of ISA week yesterday afternoon. Peter Smith, president of the Students' Society, addressed the crowd, who were led in "song" by the Plumbers Philharmonic.

Marrie Altmejd

Jagan talks here today

Dr. Cheddi Jagan, former Prime Minister of British Guiana and current Leader of the Opposition in Guyana will speak today at 1 pm in L26 and again at 8 pm in Union 123-124 on the political problems which currently face Latin America.

As leader of the People's Progressive Party since 1950, Dr. Jagan has been in constant conflict with the British



CHEDDI JAGAN

to speak on Latin American problems

authorities because of his left-wing policies. In 1961 and 1964 governments he led were dismissed by the British and a new constitution declared.

In the 1964 elections just prior to independence Dr. Jagan's party polled the highest popular vote, but as a result of proportional representation did not form the government.

Dr. Jagan, who was educated at Harvard and Northwestern Universities, has written a number of books.

Tripartite commission to do study on university-government relations

OTTAWA (CUP) — Doug Ward, Past President of CUS announced Sunday a commission, jointly sponsored by students, faculty and national administrative organizations will be set up to study university-government relations and issue a report on it within a year.

The Ford Foundation has given the group \$150,000 to finance the study.

Ward said the commission is a major breakthrough in student decision-making, as it is the first time the student's voice has been recognized in decisions of national organizations.

The other groups participating in the study are the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT), the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (UCC), and L'Union Générale des Etudiants du Québec (UGEQ).

The three main questions to be examined by the commission are:

- to define the distinctive role of the university in a changing society,
- to study the competing necessities of academic freedom and public control,
- to define the instruments needed for university-government relations.

Ward suggested that one of the three commissioners be Gunnar Myrdal, noted economist, sociologist and statesman, whose recent book, *Beyond the Welfare State*, gained wide academic acclaim. The two other commissioners will come from academic and government circles.

Ward is the representative from CUS on the steering committee of the commission. UGEQ representative is Robert Tessler, past vice-president of the union.

When the Ford foundation asked why the group wanted foreign funds to finance the

study, they were told that the commission was simply "appropriating a little money that had gone across the border."

New action at Berkeley lacks campus support

by DAVID BERSON

Collegiate Press Service

BERKELEY, CALIF. — The Movement Against Political Suspensions (MAPS) has sputtered to a near standstill.

At a Sunday mass meeting at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, plans for disrupting the functioning of the university were cancelled.

The Movement has been protesting the recommendation of Dean of Students Arleigh Williams that 11 University of California students be suspended for their participation in unauthorized campus rallies during Stop-the-Draft Week in October.

An ultimatum to Chancellor Roger Heyns that he rule on the suspensions before Monday also was lifted at the meeting, which was attended by 1,000 students. Heyns, who must pass final judgment on the fate of the students, was away from the UC campus last week and has not yet announced his decision.

In a letter to the university community published in Monday's issue of the *Daily Cal*, the chancellor said, "These are not simple cases, precisely because they involve allegations of violations of university rules that go well beyond a simple effort to protest the injunction under which we all suffered."

"Threats of disruption damaging"

"Even more damaging to institutions for rational, impartial decision-making are the threats of disruption made in the last few days to coerce my decision."

The students are charged with using sound equipment unauthorized by the University during the anti-draft rallies which were enjoined by an Alameda county judge. They have indicated they will appeal the case to the faculty-student Committee on Student Conduct.

The Movement has had only mild support, mostly from Berkeley's hardcore militants. The student newspaper blasted MAPS' Monday ultimatum in a Friday editorial, and the student senate has given only restrained support. Campus-wide support has been sparse.

The Movement is also plagued by internal conflict between older students involved in the free speech movement of 1964 and more militant activists who organized the recent anti-draft demonstrations at the Oakland army induction centre.

CUS to abandon secret reports

OTTAWA (CUP) — The Canadian Union of Students will abandon its policy of writing confidential field secretary reports.

The CUS Executive passed a resolution Saturday calling for full reports to the campus by field workers, rather than confidential reports for the use of the Secretariat.

The move was made after the practice came under sharp attack from UBC President Shaun Sullivan and other members of the Board of Directors. Sullivan termed the confidential reports "crap". He said since CUS attacks secrecy in university government, it should not practice it itself.

CUS President Hugh Armstrong maintained field work reports prepared by the associate secretaries were to be circulated within the Secretariat only.

CUS Vice-President Don Mitchell said the reports were also for the use of other field workers returning to campuses, and

they were confidential because they discussed "personalities" on campus in frank terms. He said "this is not fair to the individual concerned".

University of Manitoba President Chris Westdal said that if field workers find deficiencies in the work of the local elected students, they should let the students involved know. "I want to be told," he said.

"No right"

Sullivan said field workers are paid by the members. "They have no right to write secret reports", he said.

Peter Simmie, Finance Commissioner of the Board, objected to reports in print about personalities on campuses. "I won't tolerate any confidential information put into a file about a person," he said.

Sullivan said the reason for his attack is that a field worker had spent a week on the UBC campus and "did not give any feedback to the elected student government".

"Field workers should work for the campus", he said, "they are working for the campus, not for themselves".

Past CUS President Doug Ward also objected to confidential field reports. He said these reports have no place in the national union because they breed the concept of an on-going Secretariat.

The role of the field worker was discussed in relation to his work through a council that may be hostile to CUS programs or inactive.

Barry McPeake, Ontario Representative on the Board, said it may be necessary to bypass student government from time to time to get "real work" done.

Sullivan said if a field worker started to subvert the work of his council on campus, he would work to pull his campus out of CUS.

Western rejects token membership

LONDON, ONT. (CUP) — The students' Council of the University of Western Ontario has rejected token participation on the university's board of governors by a vote of 18 to 4.

The board-approved recommendation that students be represented by one person, who graduated at least one year before taking his position was considered "worse than nothing" by Peter Larson, student council president.

Larson thinks that "unless the student representative suffers what the student does, we don't know if he is arguing our point of view".

Although the rector would be elected by the students, the board would have the right to stipulate requirements for eligibility.

NOVEMBER 21, 1987

The McGill Daily is published five times a week by the Students' Society of McGill University at 3480 McTavish Street, Telephone 875-5510. Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash Postage paid at Montreal. Editorial opinions expressed are those of the Managing Board and not the official opinion of the Students Council.

Printed at 8430 Casgrain St.
Metropolitan Rota Offset Press Corporation 109

MANAGING BOARD

Peter Allnutt Editor-in-Chief
Marc Raboy Managing Editor
Elly Alboim Business Manager
Pierre Fournier Supplement Editor

DEPARTMENT HEADS

Danny Levinson (News Editor); Murray Hirsh (Associate News Editor); Ellen Roseman (Newsfeatures Editor); Vivian Wiseman (Associate Supplement Editor); Clara Mian (Copy Editor); Dave Carin (Sports Editor); Mike Bandler (Photography Editor); J. David Garmaise (Archives Librarian); Van Roberts (Advertising Manager). physics is such an exciting subject: extracting solutions, suffering displacements, enjoying forces; great if you're perverted (hb), but if not... hot piece of gossip: latest hero of the folk scene participated in an impromptu hootenanny on the first floor of the Union this morning... anyone who can guess who he is wins a free trip to the gazette night police desk... (thanks to Melanie Johnson and Jan the reactionaries gone bad (what would there be over?) Suzanne Telex Sandra David Morrie Judi Marc Elly Murray and assorted wafflers... Leslie attacked every piece of copy that came across the desk... nick and clara, part of the florid foursome helped too... maybe I'll even get there... DANNY... this might be my first nonoverset masthead... probably not

Business Boot-camp

We aren't the only ones in Canada to have sit-ins and watch city police stroll on campus. At the University of Toronto, students sat-in while Dow recruiting officers interviewed on campus.

They obtained a postponement and a half-promise for discussion from the University vice-president. If a change does not result, they promised to blockade the Administration Building.

The same issue has sparked police-

student battles on many campuses in the United States. At the University of Wisconsin, centre of the most violent protests, demonstrations against military recruiting led a Circuit Court Judge to issue a court order banning the sit-ins. The injunction restrains students from "obstructing the functions of the university", which includes the recruiting.

The ruling goes to the core of the problem. What, exactly, are the functions of the university? And the sit-ins pose a derivative question. Who is to control them?

In the case of recruiting, as in others,

McGill appears to be side-stepping both issues. Dow and CIL were to recruit here this week, but as a letter from the Principal indicates, chose not to because of the trouble that might ensue. They won't be here but the question of whether they should be has not been resolved.

The problem cannot be allowed to lie fallow. First our university must decide if it is going to aid corporations who supply the war in Viet Nam. Then it must re-evaluate its whole relationship with the business community.

The demand curve of local industry can no longer be accepted as a determining factor in university curricula. It is very easy to satisfy these short-run needs but they must go under when our larger responsibilities to society are at stake.

Recruiting is not an isolated matter separate from the present crisis. An examination of base concepts has begun and this is yet another dimension for investigation. We are about to define the multivariate roles played here and in this process, a redefinition of the university will be called for. Dow and CIL are dangerous — their very presence assumes a university that should not be allowed to exist.

Letters

On the ramparts

Sir,
So, the Students' Council has finally decided to act. In a last ditch attempt to win the confidence of the student body, the Council has readied its guns. We may not lose yet.

But, as the song goes, "Where were you when we Needed You." The time to act was Nov. 3, 1987 when the article was first printed. The Students' Council, not the administration, should have "tried" the "Dynamic Duo plus One."

I believe that we, the students, should at least have our voices heard in decisions affecting us. However, we are not mature or responsible enough to own this University, as is witnessed by the flagrant breaking of the law by those students who forcibly entered Dr. Robertson's office. Violence never leads to understanding, as is witnessed by the outcome of the "break-in affair."

But, now that Students' Council has brought out its guns we the students must back the Council to the hilt. It has made a momentous decision and for this we would show some thanks. Better late than never.

Aaron Muscott, BSc 2

Nous aussi

Monsieur,

On est trois étudiants à McGill depuis quatre ans et on pense que maintenant le moment est venu d'apprendre à parler l'anglais. On vous écrit car on pense qu'avec votre position influente avec les anglophones de McGill vous pourriez nous aider à obtenir \$1,800 pour aller prendre des leçons à Berlitz.

On trouve que l'argent qui a été voté pour les trois membres du Conseil des Etudiants, qui ne sont membres de ce conseil

(Continued on Page 8)

Principal's statement

The controversy over the case of the students now appearing before the Senate Committee on Student Discipline has given rise to a number of questions in the minds of students. I would like to try to clarify the position for the benefit of those students who may not have been able to follow the story consecutively through statements that have been made thus far.

1. Who is responsible for discipline in the University?

The Senate is ultimately responsible. It "exercises general disciplinary authority over the student body of the University" (University Statutes). Under the Code of Student Disciplinary procedures, Senate delegates authority to various officers and bodies, amongst them the Principal (who has jurisdiction over all offences committed by the students), the Committee on Student Discipline and the Students' Council.

2. What disciplinary powers has the Students' Council?

Under the Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures the Students' Council may exercise disciplinary powers over an offence committed by a student against University discipline.

But the Students' Council does not have the sole right to hear disciplinary cases. The Senate has an overriding jurisdiction.

The only penalties that the Students' Council can impose are "a fine not exceeding fifty dollars or suspension of all or some of the privileges of the Society" (Section 6.3, Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures). The Students' Council cannot do anything to affect the position of the student in the University.

3. Why were the present cases referred to the Senate Com-

mittee and not to the Students' Council?

Because I believed that the situation called for an examination of the students' status in the University, a matter over which the Students' Council has no authority.

4. Was the position of the students prejudged?

No. I did not hold a summary hearing, as I have the right to do. I believed it more appropriate to refer the case immediately to the Committee on Student Discipline. The students were not suspended pending hearing or decision.

5. What is the make up of the Senate Committee on Student Discipline?

The Committee is composed of members of the Teaching Faculty nominated by Senate as a standing committee on 22 February, 1987. Seven faculties are represented on this committee.

In setting up the Committee Senate aimed to be represented by a body that would include a range of interest and judgment, capable of judging the wide variety of cases that might be brought before it.

6. Have the procedures that have been followed to date been in line with the existing rules in the University?

Yes. The rules have been followed to the letter and in the full belief that the interests of both the students and of the University are fully protected.

7. Can the Rules be improved?

Possibly. As the Committee that drafted the Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures stated in its letter of transmission "When it is put into practice it is not unlikely that unforeseen circumstances will indicate modifications on occasion. Senate should not be hesitant in making amendments

from time to time, or in reviewing the whole Code after it has been in force for two or three years".

But changes can be made by the governing bodies of the University and should only be made if better ways can be found to administer discipline fairly. To make changes rapidly, or while a serious enquiry is under way, will likely lead to errors. Senate has now indicated its willingness to review procedures by setting up a tripartite committee of Senate, Faculty and students to conduct a common enquiry into these matters.

8. Has any flexibility been shown?

Several permissible modifications in the original procedures have been made in view of the particular circumstances of the present case.

Senate has invited the Students' Council to nominate two students to sit on the Disciplinary Committee. The University has made available to the Committee closed circuit television facilities. The Committee, with the consent of those concerned, has used these facilities so that the students' desire to follow proceedings can be met. In addition, the University has provided a verbatim record of proceedings and the Committee has permitted the presence of counsel and advisors to the students.

9. What are the plans for the future concerning the part that students will play in University government?

For a number of years students at McGill have been free to run their own affairs almost completely. As members of a number of Senate and certain Faculty and departmental committees they have been involved to some degree in academic decision making. Nearly two years ago at the time of the Duff-Berdahl enquiry it became

clear that students could contribute much more than they had asked to do up to that time.

The special committee established to consider the Duff-Berdahl Report completed its work recently.

It has recommended extensive changes in the forms of University government which will, if adopted, involve members of the staff and of the student body much more extensively in the various aspects of university government.

The staff and the students have been asked to comment on this report and when available their views and recommendations will be brought before joint meetings of the Board of Governors and Senate.

The more complex and the larger a University becomes the more difficult it is to "administer". Clearly the Governors cannot do it alone, nor can the Senate, or the staff or the students. A combination of these various interests and abilities must be found which will give balance. We must find a combination of the expertise and range of knowledge that can come from the appointment to the Board of Governors of men and women from various parts of the community. We must profit from the professional knowledge and academic experience of members of the Staff drawn from all parts of the university and the enthusiasm and acute concern of the students. The Committee on University Government believes that we shall come close to this type of useful combination if its recommendations are adopted.

Whatever changes are made in the recommendations of the Committee it seems certain that the role of the student in university government will be greatly increased.

20 November, 1987.

H. ROCKE ROBERTSON

Excerpted text of Fekete's motion for writ of evocation

Following are excerpts from a public document filed in Superior Court yesterday by John Fekete and counsel. It asks for a Writ of Evocation to determine jurisdiction in Fekete's case, now before the Senate Committee on Student Discipline, and will be presented in Superior Court, Practise Division, on Friday November 24.

It names John Fekete as Petitioner and, as Respondents, McGill University, the Committee on Student Discipline, its individual members Perry Meyer, S. M. Banfill, R. I. Brown, R. M. Gill, M. Horowitz, James McCutcheon, Miss Helen R. Neilson, Miss Helen C. Reynolds, H. D. Woods, H. H. Yates and C. D. Solin, and H. Roche Robertson.

MOTION FOR A WRIT OF EVOCATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLES 33 AND 846 OF THE QUEBEC CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY DECLARES:

1. He is presently attending McGill University as a full time student of the fourth year proceeding to a degree of Bachelor of Arts in the Honours English curriculum, having attended McGill University in the previous three academic years;

2. He is a scholarship student having received or earned the following scholarships and prizes...

10. On Monday, November 6th, 1967 the Students' Council of McGill University met and as it was entitled to, adopted a disciplinary resolution deploring the publication "as being in poor taste and request(ing) the managing board to publish an official retraction";

11. This meeting of the Students' Council was attended by Dr. H. Roche Robertson, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University who requested, and was allowed, to address the meeting;

12. By attending and participating in this meeting of the Students' Council on November 6th, 1967, respondent Roche Robertson acting on behalf of McGill University, obviously admitted, recognized and ratified this exercise of disciplinary jurisdiction by the Students' Council...

14. In the morning of Monday, November 6th, 1967, your Petitioner, through one of the undersigned attorneys, wired respondent H. Roche Robertson requesting a postponement of the scheduled hearing in order to examine the file and prepare a defence; asking that in view of the publicity given by the University to the charges, the hearing itself be public; and demanding the stenographic recording of all proceedings; the whole under reserve of Petitioner's right to challenge the jurisdiction of the respondent Committee;

15. However, the meeting of the Committee on Student Discipline which was scheduled for 2:00 pm on Tuesday, November 7th, 1967, could not take place and was postponed to Monday, November 13th, 1967, no decision being rendered on Petitioner's said requests;

16. On November 7th, 1967, as appears from the front page of the McGill Daily on November 8th, respondent H. Roche Robertson held a press conference to discuss the charges he himself had laid against Petitioner and in the course of this press conference:

(a) he announced that the original charge against Petitioner would be changed;

(b) he asserted that the role of the Students' Council was restricted to supervision of students' activities alone — which is a misstatement of both the University's own Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures approved by the University Senate on December 22nd, 1965, and of the Constitution of the Students' Society of McGill University, also approved by the Senate of the University;

(c) claimed that the University could exercise a jurisdiction parallel to that of the Students' Council in the matter; and

(d) suggested that there were serious doubts as to the right of Petitioner to remain as a student at McGill University;

17. It should be noted that it was at least the second time that respondent H. Roche Robertson, the Chief officer of the University, was commenting publicly on his own pending charges;

18. Respondent, H. Roche Robertson, while admittedly acting for the benefit of the University as he saw it, simultaneously deprived Petitioner of any chance he might have had for a fair trial;

19. In fact, on the very same day, and again before Petitioner was officially advised, the University published the new charges it had laid against Petitioner and the other two students involved;

20. Having thus begun to conduct the prosecution of Petitioner in the newspapers, and, as will be seen anon, usurped the jurisdiction it had itself granted to the Students' Council, the University then proceeded to usurp the disciplinary jurisdiction it had delegated to the respondent Committee on Student discipline by announcing (again in the press) that the Senate of McGill University had decided to invite the Students' Council to send two voting delegates to the hearings of Committee on Student discipline (McGill Daily, November 9, 1967, front page).

21. Incidentally, this decision of the respondent's Senate to add new members to respondent's Committee, well-intentioned though it was, violated the University's own statutes and regulations;

22. The Students' Council quite properly refused this invitation to ratify by the presence of its delegates unfair and illegal procedures;

23. At the same meeting, which was held on November 8th, 1967, the Senate announced that it had decided to ask the Committee on Student Discipline to consider conducting Petitioner's case in public, provided the consent of Petitioner could be obtained (McGill Daily, November 9, page 5);

24. On Monday, November 13th, 1967, Petitioner, accompanied by one of his undersigned attorneys, attended the surreptitious and in camera hearing of the Committee of Student Discipline;

25. He was then handed a copy of a completely new charge which read:

Participating in the publication on campus of an article which contravenes standards of decency acceptable by and in this University: namely, an article in the column entitled "Boll Weevils" appearing on page 4 of the supplement called "Flux" of the McGill Daily of November 3rd, 1967, the whole incompatible with your status as a student of this University.

26. Petitioner, through one of his undersigned attorneys, immediately moved:

(a) that the Committee had no jurisdiction to hear such charge, and this for a number of reasons, some of which are outlined hereafter;

(b) subsidiarily, asking the members of the Committee to recuse themselves on the ground of bias and partially since some had attended the meeting of the Senate of the University, and/or the meeting of the Faculty of the University, at which the present case had been abundantly discussed;

(c) without prejudice to the foregoing, that Petitioner be informed what specific University regulation he was supposed to have infringed; and

(d) that if a hearing were to be held, it be held in public since the University had seen fit to publicize the charges and to make press statements about them;

27. Present during Petitioner's presentation of these motions was Mtre. James K. Hugessen, a well-known member of the Bar and attorney to respondent H. Roche Robertson and to McGill University, who had advised the University and its officers in connection with the present prosecution and in fact, had assisted them in drafting the original and subsequent charges against Petitioner and in the procedure followed generally;

28. After Petitioner, through one of his undersigned attorneys, presented the above motions, he was requested by respondent Perry Meyer to leave the room together with the other students and their representatives while the Committee deliberated;

29. The Committee then proceeded to deliberate secretly in the presence, and with the participation of Mtre. James K.

Hugessen although the latter is not a member of the Committee, is involved *de facto* in the prosecution of Petitioner, and Petitioner was not given an opportunity to either hear or know what representations Mtre James K. Hugessen made to the Committee on behalf of the University or the respondent H. Roche Robertson, the whole in violation of every elementary principle of natural justice;

30. After approximately one hour's time, Petitioner was called back into the room and informed by respondent Perry Meyer that the Committee had decided to reject every one of his motions and that the hearings would not be public, after which the meeting insofar as Petitioner was concerned, was adjourned to 2:00 pm on Thursday, November 16th, 1967;

31. On Thursday morning November 16th, 1967, on the front page of the McGill Daily appeared a statement from the Committee on Student Discipline in which the latter announced that it had changed its mind for the second time and that if the students concerned consented, it would televise the proposed hearing over the closed circuit television facilities of the University;

32. Again, and characteristic of the unprecedented trial by newspapers conducted of the Petitioner he was first informed of this new and extraordinary decision affecting him by a daily newspaper;

33. At approximately 2:00 pm on Thursday November 16th, 1967, Petitioner again attended before the Committee on Student Discipline assisted by one of his undersigned attorneys, and without prejudice to his earlier motions, through said attorney, drew the Committee's attention to the fatal impropriety of its having deliberated on the previous Monday together with an attorney who is not a member of the Committee and who represented the respondent H. Roche Robertson in the absence and without the consent of Petitioner, and begging the Committee (in a last attempt to avoid having to seek the protection of the Superior Court) to recuse itself because of bias, gross irregularities and loss of jurisdiction;

34. This motion too was rejected although this time Mtre. James K. Hugessen was not allowed to participate in the Committee's deliberations;

35. The respondent Committee then, through respondent Perry Meyer, insisted that Petitioner agree to the proposed closed circuit televising of his trial as an alternative to in camera hearings;

36. When Petitioner replied that he was entitled to a public trial and that closed circuit television was not the same thing as a public trial, and a flagrant abuse of the quasi-judicial process, he was threatened by respondent Perry Meyer with the Committee publishing in the newspapers a statement that after requesting a public trial Petitioner had turned down the proffered closed circuit television;

(Continued on page 6)

Excerpts . . .

(Continued from page 5)

37. Petitioner immediately protested against this scandalous threat, the gravity of which is even more apparent when one recalls the above-mentioned string of improper statements issued by the University to the newspapers in the course of its prosecution of Petitioner;

38. In fact, it would appear that the University's prime concern in this prosecution has been to calm a segment of public opinion and to conduct a public relations campaign rather than safeguarding the rights of Petitioner;

39. After the adjournment of Petitioner's hearing, the Committee then immediately proceeded to hold a televised hearing in the case of the other two students involved;

40. Petitioner asks that this Honourable Court, exercising the superintending and reforming power it possesses under articles 33 and 846 of the Quebec Code of Civil Procedure and under the provisions of law generally, evoke before it the said charge presently pending against him before the Committee on Student Discipline on the grounds that it is acting without jurisdiction or in excess thereof, that the proceedings before it are affected by gross irregularities and there is reason to believe that justice will not be done, and that there has been an abuse of authority of a nature to cause a flagrant injustice, the whole more fully outlined hereinafter;

41. Article VIII (5) of the University-Approved Constitution of the Students' Society of McGill University provides that "except in cases of cheating in examinations, the Students' Council shall have the right to summon, hear, and discipline any member of the Students' Society for an offence against the rules and regulations of the University, or of the Students' Society" thereby recognizing the jurisdiction of the Students' Council not only over student matters but even over violations of University rules and regulations;

42. This jurisdiction of the Students' Council is again stated in the University's own Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures, section 6 (1) whereof, states that the Students' Council "may exercise disciplinary powers... over an offence committed by a student... against University discipline, provided that the offence was not committed while undergoing an examination or instruction under University supervision";

43. Both the original and revised charges against Petitioner are not contemplated by any University regulation (although other infractions are) so that the charges are *ex post facto* fabrications which violate the maxim *nulla poena sine lege* and do not permit respondent Committee to exercise any jurisdiction over Petitioner;

44. Section 6 (5) permits the Committee on Student Discipline to evoke a case relating to University discipline pending before the Students' Council or to revise any decision of the latter;

45. Not only has the Committee on Student Discipline not evoked the proceedings when they were pending before the Students' Council, nor revised the above-mentioned decision of the Students' Council, but as was seen above, the respondent H. Locke Robertson, in his capacity of Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University, attended at a meeting of the Students' Council and participated therein, there-

by ratifying the jurisdiction which the University itself had delegated to the Students' Council;

46. Furthermore, the publication in question which in no way dealt with any aspect of the University, does not come within the jurisdiction, even by evocation or revision of the University's Committee on Student Discipline since the Constitution of the Students' Society of McGill University approved and ratified by the University itself, states in Article V (6) that "The Students' Council shall be responsible for the management and control of the McGill Daily through the Editor-in-Chief", so that the *lien de droit* is between the University Senate and the Students' Council but not between the University and your Petitioner, and this by the University's own constitution, statutes and rules;

47. Also, in the exercise of its superintending and superintending power, this Honourable Court can and must consider that at the present time a university can no longer be treated as a privileged, private institution but is a legally constituted public institution fulfilling a public duty and role, soliciting and receiving public funds, and that it cannot arbitrarily intervene in the rights of citizens who happen to be students at university to express their political, social or literary views as they themselves see fit, and that articles in students' newspaper owned and operated by the students are not within the jurisdiction of the university, especially if they in no way relate to the academic functions which are the only ones for which the university exists . . .

50. This Honourable Court has a right and a duty to intervene in view of the gross irregularities attending the prosecution of the charges against your Petitioner, and more particularly:

- (a) the conduct of Petitioner's trial by newspaper statements made by respondent H. Locke Robertson, a situation aggravated by the presence of said respondent's legal advisor, Mre. James K. Hugessen during the deliberations of the Committee;
- (b) the participation of members of the Committee in discussions of a case pending before it with third parties;
- (c) the publication of Committee decisions before Petitioner had either been officially advised of them, or even notified;
- (d) the issuance by Respondent Perry Meyer of an ultimatum to Petitioner to accept televised hearing under threat of public statements by the Committee to the press;
- (e) the decision of the Committee on Student Discipline that it would not grant to a person charged publicly and persecuted by publicity, a public hearing to vindicate himself, but requesting him to select an alternative between star chamber proceedings or a television spectacle;

51. Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that justice cannot be conducted in the Roman Circus atmosphere produced by the presence of television cameras, particularly when Petitioner has no control over the manner in which the trial will be televised, nor over the outlets where it will be shown and when witnesses may be intimidated by the presence of television cameras;

52. The irreparable damage caused to your Petitioner by the unfair and unprecedented publicity given to the charges

by University is further evidenced by the fact that on November 14th, 1967, he was advised by the Beta Sigma Phi Sorority that "due to all your unfavourable publicity in the past few weeks", his \$1,000.00 English literature scholarship would not be presented to him;

53. The Committee on Student Discipline of McGill University is an inferior disciplinary tribunal, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, this appears from the University's own Code of Student Disciplinary Procedure:

- (a) under section 8 (1) it has "the duty of hearing and disposing of all cases referred to it";
- (b) under sections 4 and 8, the student affected is summoned to a hearing where he is charged and supposedly given an opportunity to justify his conduct;
- (c) under sections 4 and 8, the Committee on Student Discipline disposes of the case by either exonerating the student or declaring the case closed, or by applying a series of penalties going from admonishment to reprimand, to requiring security for good behaviour, the imposition of a fine, confinement to the student residence, exclusion from the residence, punitive suspension, dismissal suspension or expulsion from University;
- (d) under section 8 (7) the Committee on Student Discipline may even impose as a condition on the student "that he make good any damage which he has caused or otherwise rectify situation which he has created, or help to create";
- (e) under section 8 (8) the Committee on Student discipline may even subject the student to administrative suspension during the hearing or until adjudication;
- (f) furthermore, under section, 10 (a), all penalties and conditions imposed by the Committee on Student Discipline "are final and are executory on being pronounced" except that in the case of dismissal or expulsion from University, the penalty must be confirmed by the Senate.

54. Respondent McGill University is a body politic and corporate which is subject to the supervisory and superintending power of this Honourable Court pursuant to Articles 33 and 846 of the Quebec Code of Civil Procedures;

55. Under section 9 of the Code of Student Disciplinary Procedures of McGill University, there is generally no appeal from "adjudications" (sic) rendered or made by the respondent Committee constituting discipline except in the specific case where a student is required to withdraw from the University "for reasons of health".

56. Furthermore, in evaluating the gravity of the unprecedented conduct of McGill University and of its representatives in the present instance, this Honourable Court is entitled to weigh, and should weigh, the enormous consequences for a university student, particularly one who is in his last year which might result from his dismissal or expulsion from the University: it effectively terminates his academic career, deprives him of the possibility of admission to a reputable university, nullifies the efforts and sacrifices of four years of a young man's life, and, to all intents and purposes, carries with him a life sentence in many respects more burdensome than a criminal record;

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1967

57. In such circumstances, it is thus of paramount importance that the conduct of a disciplinary tribunal of the University be above reproach and as nearly judicial as possible, which is obviously not the case here;

58. It is only with the greatest reluctance that Petitioner invokes the protection of this Honourable Superior Court and had he been able to secure a fair trial, he might have waived his legal objections to the jurisdiction of respondents and in fact might still be willing to do so if it were possible for the respondent University to guarantee a trial in accordance with the principles of natural justice . . .

FOR THESE REASONS, MAY IT PLEASE THIS HONOURABLE COURT TO ORDER:

- (a) The issue of a Writ of Summons of Evocation;
- (b) that all Respondents immediately cease and desist from any further proceedings or prosecutions against your Petitioner in connection with the matters referred to in the present motion;
- (c) That Respondents transmit the entire file including the records taken by Respondent Solin and/or his secretary, to this Honourable Court within such delay as may be ordered;
- (d) That Respondents, and particularly McGill University, do not do anything which might affect the status quo of Petitioner's position or constitute a retaliation against him for taking the present proceedings, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, not to issue any further public statements about the charges against petitioner, not to impose any interim sanctions or suspensions on him, not to deprive him of the benefit of the University Scholarship he is holding, and not to interfere with his position at the university in general;
- (e) And subsidiarily, but without prejudice to the foregoing, should this Honourable Court decide not to evoke the present case, that respondents be ordered to conduct a hearing of the charges against Petitioner in a Quasi judicial manner, in accordance with the rules of natural justice, in public and before an unbiased tribunal; the whole with costs.

(Sgd)

ROBINSON SHEPPARD DRYMER & SHAPIRO
ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER.
JOHN FETHERSTONHAUGH, Q.C.
COUNSEL

NOTICE

TO: All Respondents in the present case:

SIRS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE of the foregoing Motion for a Writ of Evocation and that it will be presented for adjudication on Friday, November 24th, 1967 before the Practise Division of this Honourable Court at 10:00 am or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard and govern yourselves accordingly.

MONTREAL, November 20th, 1967.

(Sgd)

ROBINSON SHEPPARD DRYMER & SHAPIRO
ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER.
JOHN FETHERSTONHAUGH, Q.C.
COUNSEL

STUDENTS' SOCIETY ELECTION

A Sub Committee of Senate has been set up to examine the nature of the University, its quality, functions and values.

This committee to consist of 12 members (4 representatives from each of the following): Senate, Student Body, McGill Association of University Teachers.

NOMINATIONS ARE HEREBY CALLED FOR THE FOUR STUDENTS REPRESENTATIVES TO THIS TRIPARTITE AD HOC COMMITTEE FROM THE FOLLOWING FACULTIES AND SCHOOLS:

2 representatives from ARTS & SCIENCE

1 representative from LAW, MEDICINE, DENTISTRY, GRADUATE STUDIES

1 representative from all other Faculties or Schools.

1. THE NOMINEES MUST HAVE SPENT AT LEAST ONE FULL YEAR AT MCGILL UNIVERSITY AND MUST BE IN GOOD STANDING WITH THE UNIVERSITY.

2. ALL NOMINATIONS MUST BE SIGNED BY AT LEAST 50 STUDENTS AND COUNTERSIGNED BY THE NOMINEE.

3. ALL NOMINATIONS MUST BE HANDED IN TO THE SECRETARY-TREASURER OF THE STUDENTS' SOCIETY BY 4 PM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1967.

4. THE ELECTIONS WILL BE HELD CONCURRENTLY WITH THE STUDENTS' COUNCIL ELECTIONS, DECEMBER 6, 1967.

NOTE: The above nominations are being called for vide Students' Council resolution of November 15, 1967.

Laiq Hanafi,
Chief Returning Officer.

today

SYMPHONIC BAND: Usual rehearsal, Redpath Hall Gallery, 6:30 pm.

ASSOC. TO END WAR IN VIETNAM: Meeting of those who witnessed Nov. 17th demonstration, and others, Union 123-124, 1 pm.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP: Engineering and Architecture Bible study, Hebrew 6, E117, 1 pm.

VIETNAMESE ASSOCIATION: Vietnamese dinner, Union Cafeteria, 6 pm. (Members invited to help in preparations — from 4 pm.)

HILLEL - SZO: Advanced Hebrew Classes, Hillel House, 7:30 pm. Folkdancing with Maestro Bernie Yablon, Hillel House, 8:30 pm.

SAVOY SOCIETY: Company Call, Union 307, 1 pm.

TRYOUTS

FOR

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

PLAY

Tues. Nov. 21

7:30 pm

Moyse Hall

STUDENTS

Come one, come all
For your annual chest x-ray

where? 517 Pine Avenue W.

when? 9 am - 12 noon or 1 pm - 3 pm as posted

who? Members of the following:

Tues. Nov. 21st — Islamic Studies and Divinity

Wed. Nov. 22nd — Education and Music

Thurs. Nov. 23rd — Law — A-M

Fri. Nov. 24th — Law — N-Z

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

PRESENTS ITS 4th ANNUAL FESTIVAL

TODAY

1:00 pm Short Films in Ballroom — Free

6:00 pm International Dinner in Cafeteria
Vietnamese Students' and Russian Circle \$1.25

8:00 pm Award-winning film —
Satyajit Ray's "The World of Apu" \$0.50
McConnell Engineering Building Room 304
Tickets at door.

TOMORROW

November 22

6:00 pm International Dinner in Cafeteria
Ukrainian and Hellenic Clubs \$1.25

8:00 pm International Fashions and Folk
Songs
Ballroom — \$0.25

CHORAL SOCIETY: Regular practice for all members, Union Ballroom, 5 pm.

CYCOM: Mr. E. Berkely speaks on LISP programming language, E 304, 1 pm. Tuesday's Fortran moved to Wednesday, this week only.

SUNAC: Adrian Rys, "Malthusian and other Classical Theories of Population", Yellow Door, 7:30 pm.

W. I. SOCIETY: Dr. Cheddi Jagan, "Prospects Facing the Caribbean and Latin America", Union 123-124, 8 pm.

STUDENT SOCIETY OF GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL: Films, light refreshments to be served, Union B23-24, 7:30 pm.

ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE CLUB: Cheddi Jagan, former PM of Guyana, on the economic problems facing Latin America, L 26, 1 pm.

ISA: Short films (free), Ballroom, 1 pm; International dinner, Vietnamese and Russian, \$1.25, Cafeteria, 6 pm; Award winning film, "The World of Apu", 50 cents, Rm. 304, McConnell Engineering Building.

SKATING: Men and Women with figure skates welcome, also WAA Intramural practice, Winter Stadium, 2-4 pm.

MARTLETS: Shorter practice, Union 307, 1 pm.

ASUS: Executive Meeting, Union B26, 7 pm.

GRADUATING STUDENTS: Photos for Old McGill, Arch., Arts and Science, Comm., Div., Dent., S-Z, 9-12 am, 1-6 pm, 1018 Sherbrooke St. W.

RADIO MCGILL: Operations training lecture, Union 457-458, 1:10 pm.

GUIDANCE SERVICE: "Efficient Reading and Study Habits", Mr. L. M. Read, Bell Telephone Company Reading Specialist.

MEXICO PROJECT CIASPP: Cell meeting, speaker, Newman Club Lounge (on Peel), 1 pm.

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION: Members of the Comm. on Const. Affairs urged to attend discussion on the English in Quebec. Meet outside door of L132, 8 pm.

NEWMAN CENTRE: Daily Mass, 1:05 pm, and 5:05 pm, and Singing, 7-8 pm, 3484 Peel.

(Continued on page 8)

Montreal Barber Shop



\$1.50

HAIRCUT
EVERY DAY
7 BARBERS
at your disposal

1483 Mansfield St.
(Near Burnside)



compu date

COMPUTER DATING

CALL 844-0032 (24 hrs) OR MAIL COUPON
Compu date, PO Box 130 Victoria St., Mt. B
Please send free booklet on computer dating to:

NAME: _____
(Please print)
ADDRESS: _____

WHAT'S WHAT

COMMERCE UNDERGRADUATE SOCIETY

Third and fourth year Commerce students interested in a Management-in-Training Program are requested to report to the CUS office, room 466 in the Union today at 1 pm. This program will send four to six students to a local business organization for practical work.

ASUS ELECTIONS

Allan Feingold and Murray Segal were acclaimed first and second year representatives respectively to the ASUS. Nominees for third year representative are Don Caragata, Gordon Garmaise and Julie Szasz. The election will be held December 6.

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY

DIALOGUE has arranged an informal discussion to consider the Senate recommendations arising out of the Duff-Berdahl Report, for Wednesday, November 22 in L 26. The panel of professors and students will include Professors J. Weldon, P. Buitenhuis, J. Corson and B. Cooney.

YAVNEH

Weekly study sessions will resume on Monday. Dr. Biberfeld will discuss Isaiah at 7 pm. The weekly Torah study will be held at 8 pm.

NEW DEMOCRATIC YOUTH

The NDY is sponsoring a speech by Ken Novakowski, Federal President of the NDY,

today at 1 pm in Union B-23. Mr. Novakowski, one of the founders of the Alberta NDY, will speak on The New Role of the Young New Democrats.

FASHION AND FOLK SONG

The International Students' Association evening of fashion and folksong will feature a duet of tabla and sitar Wednesday, November 22, at 8 pm. Admission is \$0.25.

YOUNG COMPOSERS CONCERT

The works of six young McGill composers will be presented at a concert November 24, at 8:30 pm in Redpath Hall. Tickets at \$2.00 (students \$1.00) may be obtained by telephoning the McGill Faculty of Music at 844-6311, local 482, or at the evening box office of Redpath Hall.

ENVIRONMENT

The first evening for creative dancing is Wednesday 7-9 in Union Lounge 327. At this time the constitution will be presented for approval. All those interested will be welcome.

Motion for writ...

(Continued from page 1)

mittee asking the Court for the evocation on the grounds that The Committee on Student Discipline" is acting without jurisdiction or in excess thereof, that the proceedings before it are affected by gross irregularities and there is reason to believe that justice will not be done and that there has been an abuse of authority of a nature to cause a flagrant injustice..."

Letters...

(Continued from page 4)

qu'une année pourrait servir plus utilement à nous apprendre l'anglais car nous avons encore plusieurs années d'étude devant nous.

Le Conseil des Etudiants pourrait donc quand même démontrer qu'il est trois fois supérieur en matière de bilinguisme que le Parti Conservateur.
Michel Jacques Eric B Eng IV
Robert Singer B Eng IV
André Tenne-Sens B Eng IV

today...

(Continued from page 7)

WAA: Interclass Hockey, Ed. vs AOP, Winter Stadium, 1 pm.

RUSSIAN CIRCLE: Reception and Social after Russian supper, Union 327, 8-10 pm.

ANGLICAN CHAPLAINCY: Holy Eucharist, Coffee after, 3555 University, 5:30 pm.

YELLOW DOOR COFFEE HOUSE: A reading, Poet Rinald Shooler, 3625 Aylmer, 8:30 pm.

ASSOC. TO END WAR IN VIETNAM: Workshop in Non-Violence, Union 457-458, 7:30 pm.

a players production

RHINOCEROS

by Ionesco

"A Study in animal passions"

Sir Alan Strand, Bart.

Tickets: Union Box Office

\$1.50

"Take two, they're small"

Union Theatre, Wed. Nov. 22 — Sat. Nov. 25

RED & WHITE REVUE '68

All those who wish to audition for ACTING MUST audition for SINGING too

	A - M	N - Z
Wed. Nov. 22		
ACTING	9 - 12	2 - 5
Thurs. Nov. 23		
SINGING	9 - 12	2 - 5
Fri. Nov. 24		
DANCING	9 - 2	2 - 5
B - 26 - 27 Students' University Centre		

UNION BALLROOM NOVEMBER 24 3-6 PM

FRUSTRATION

T.G.I.F. DANCE PRIZES

for

The most FRUSTRATED couple
The most DEJECTED couple
The SADDEST couple

impartial judges

ADMISSION 25 cents

IMPORTANT NOTICE

STUDENTS' SOCIETY OPINION POLL

The Executive of the Students' Society asks you for your opinion on the following:

1. Do you think the administration should drop the charges against the three students connected with the "Boll Weevils" article in the McGill Daily of November 3, 1967?
2. Would you support a student strike on this issue should the administration continue to refuse to drop the charges?

VOTE TOMORROW

AT THE FOLLOWING CENTERS

POLLS OPEN FROM 9 AM TO 4 PM

Arts Building
Leacock
McConnell Engineering
Physical Sciences Centre
Wilson Hall
Stewart Biology
Strathcona Medical
McIntyre
Music Faculty
University Centre

OTHER POLLS:

Montreal General — 12:00 - 4 pm
Chancellor Day Hall — 9 am - 2 pm
Royal Victoria College — 12:00 - 2 pm
Bishop Mountain Hall — 12:00 - 2 pm

1. Members of the Students' Society may vote at any of the above polls.
2. Students must present 1967-68 Identity Cards in order to vote for this "poll".

Laila Hanafi
Chief Returning Officer